

REMARKS

The applicant has carefully considered the Office action dated March 1, 2007, and the references it cites. In the official action, all claims were rejected claims 1, 10, 17, and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 for failing to particularly point out the claimed subject matter. Additionally, claims 1-30 were rejected as being unpatentable over Moyne et al. (US Pat. No. 7,109,979) under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e). Claims 1-6, 10-14, 17, and 24 have been amended to clarify the claims. It is respectfully submitted that the claim amendments obviate any rejection that may have been proper. The applicants respectfully submit that no new matter has been added to the claims. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all pending claims are in condition for allowance and favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Independent claim 1 is allowable. Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, a method to provide a handheld pointer-based user interface with a first communication link and a second communication link to transmit at least one of position information and operating information. The applicants respectfully submit that Moyne et al. do not teach or suggest a second communication link to transmit position information or operating information from the one or more base components to a processor configured to generate screen information on a screen of a display.

The examiner contends that the second transmitter of Moyne et al. constitutes a second communication link to transmit position information or operating information to a processor configured to generate screen information

on a screen of a display. *See official action dated March 1, 2007*, p. 3, section 8. However, the second transmitter of Moyne et al. transmits timing information that is “transmitted from the stylus 12 to the detector assembly 14 in order to synchronize the stylus 12 with the detector assembly 14.” *Moyne et. al.*, 5:53-33. The timing signals are used to synchronize the Moyne et al. detectors so that the information transmitted from the first transmitter can be calculated. *See Moyne et al.*, 5:55-61. In contrast, claim 1 recites the second communication link is to transmit position information or operating information from one or more base components to a processor.

Thus, Moyne et al. do not teach or suggest a second transmitter as the examiner suggests. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1 and all claims dependent thereon are in condition for allowance.

Independent claim 10, 17, and 24 are also patentable for at least the same reasons discussed above in association with claim 1. Therefore, the applicants submit that independent claims 10, 17, 24 and all claims dependent thereon are in condition for allowance.

Before closing, the applicant notes that claims 1-6, 10-14, 17, and 24 have been amended to to clarify the claims. Additionally, claim 10 is amended to correct a grammatical error. Consequently, the amendments to claims 1-6, 10-14, 17, and 24 do not give rise to prosecution history estoppel or limit the scope of equivalents of any of the claims under the doctrine of equivalents.

If the examiner is of the opinion that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this case, the examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the number identified below.

Respectfully submitted,

HANLEY, FLIGHT & ZIMMERMAN, LLC.
150 South Wacker Drive
Suite 2100
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 580-1020

By: Mark C. Zimmerman
Mark C. Zimmerman
Registration No. 44,006

Date: June 1, 2007